

REMARKS

In the Claims:

Claims 22-32 remain in this application. Claims 1-21 have been canceled. Claims 23-25 have been amended. Claims 26-32 have been added.

Election Requirement:

Applicants hereby affirm the telephone election to prosecute Group I-B claims 22-25, drawn to a method. As such, Applicants cancel claims 1-21.

Interview Summary:

On March 2, 2005, the Examiner, Tim Phan, spoke via telephone with Michael Bernadicou (Reg. # 35,934) regarding this patent application. A written record of the substance of the interview, in accordance with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.133, follows:

Claims 23-25 were discussed.

Regarding each of these claims, Applicants and Examiner agreed that typographical errors had been made. Claim 23 should depend from claim 22 rather than claim 23, claim 24 should depend from claim 23 rather than claim 24, and claim 25 should depend from claim 24 rather than claim 25.

Each of claims 23-25 have been appropriately amended in the current response to correct these typographical errors.

Amendment To The Title:

The Title of the Application has been amended to more closely match the subject matter of the claims.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bindra et al. (US 5,129,142) (hereinafter “Bindra”).

Bindra fails to disclose removing a section of the bottom conductor to result in a via hole as is recited in claim 22; the rejection is unsupported in the art and should be withdrawn. The Examiner’s statement on page 6 of the Office Action that Brinda discloses, “removing a section of the bottom conductor (cf. Fig. 2C, 3) to result in a via hole (Cf. Fig. 2C, 8),” is in error. Rather than Fig. 2C of Brinda disclosing removing a section of the bottom conductor (3) to form via hole (8), Fig. 2C of Brinda discloses forming a via hole (8) by removing a section of the dielectric (1). This can be clearly seen by comparing Figs. 2B and 2C of Brinda. The specification of Brinda confirms this, stating, “2B shows 2B after the via holes (8) and lands (7) have been opened up in the **dielectric material.**” (Col. 5, lines 26-28; emphasis added.) As the rejection is unsupported by the art, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw it.

Additionally, Bindra fails to disclose depositing a conductive material in the well and via hole to electrically connect the top conductor with the bottom conductor as is recited in claim 22; the rejection is unsupported in the art and should be withdrawn. The Examiner has characterized (2) of Bindra as the top conductor, and has characterized (3) of Bindra as the bottom conductor (page 6 of the Office Action). However, Brinda does not disclose conductive material in a well and via hole to connect the top conductor (2) to bottom conductor (3). Bindra actually discloses quite the opposite: as seen in Fig. 3B, dielectric (4) **insulates** the top conductor (2) from the bottom conductor (3). Thus, Bindra fails to disclose an electrical connection between top conductor (2) and bottom conductor (3). As the rejection is unsupported by the art, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw it.

The Examiner states, “well known in the printed circuit board to be connected or not to a through-hole circuitry.” This appears to be a nonsensical sentence fragment that does nothing to support the rejection. If this is Official Notice that one of skill in the art would

know that (2) of Bindra is electrically connected to (3) of Bindra, Applicants request that the Examiner cite a reference to support this or withdraw the rejection. Note that the statement indicates that such knowledge in the art does not exist, since it says, “connected **or not**,” implying that skill in the art would not lead one to any conclusions whether (2) is connected to (3).

Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22. The rejections of claims 23-25 are thus also unsupported in the art for the reasons provided above. The rejections of claim 23-25 should be withdrawn.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/3/05



Michael D. Plimier
Reg. No. 43,004
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Intel Corporation
Mail Stop SC4-202
P.O. Box 5326
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326
(408) 765-7857



CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
(37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria VA, 22313-1450 on June 3, 2005.

Michael Plimier
Name of Person Sending Facsimile Correspondence ^{mp 6/3/05}
MP
Signature